arXiv:1510.01985v1 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 7 Oct 2015

Diagrammatic description of a quantum system coupled to strong noise

Michael Marthaler[1] and Juha Leppäkangas[1]

[1]*Institut für Theoretische Festkörperphysik, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, D-76128 Karlsruhe, Germany*

(Dated: October 8, 2015)

We study a system-bath description in the strong coupling regime, where it is not possible to derive a master equation for the reduced density matrix by a direct expansion in the system-bath coupling. A particular example is a bath with significant spectral weight at low frequencies. Through an unitary transformation it can be possible to find a more suitable small expansion parameter. Within this approach we construct a formally exact expansion of the master equation on the Keldysh contour. The lowest-order expansion is similar to the so-called $P(E)$-theory or non-interacting blip approximation (NIBA). The analysis of the higher-order contributions shows that there are two different classes of higher-order diagrams. We study how the form of the spectral function affects their convergence.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Lc,03.65.Yz

I. INTRODUCTION

System-bath approaches are commonly used in many branches of physics[1], but they have been of particular importance in the fields of quantum transport and quantum optics[2]. In general, in a system-bath approach one defines a 'system' which contains a small number of degrees of freedom and a 'bath' which contains a large number of degrees of freedom. The system and the bath are mostly coupled linearly, although different forms of coupling are possible.

A common approach to solve this type of a problem is to expand the time evolution of the full density matrix in the coupling between the system and the bath, and trace out the bath degrees of freedom. This results in an effective equation of motion for the (reduced) density matrix of the system, the well known examples being the Bloch-Redfield[3] and Lindblad master-equations[4]. Both these approaches require a weak coupling between the system and the bath. To be more precise, these approaches require a bath correlator with a decay rate which is large compared to the effective system-bath coupling. However, if the system-bath coupling is rather strong, other approaches can be more useful. For two-level systems a well known approach is the use of the polaron transformation[6–8], i.e. tranformation into the bath-dressed system-states. This approach has first been introduced to study polaronic hopping of electons with wavefunctions confined to single atomic sites[5]. Using the polaron transformation, the bath contribution is completely diagonalised. It is then necessary to expand in the terms of the original system Hamiltonian that do not commute with the system-bath coupling operator, which now become dressed by the bath operators. This approach is also known as non-interacting blip approximation[9–11] (NIBA) and can be extended to the weakly interacting blip approximation[12,13].

It is not always straightforward to define the coupling strength between the system and the bath. In many cases it is helpful to consider the spectral function of the bath modes to understand which method might work best. If the spectral function is very smooth, a direct expansion in the system-bath coupling is usually warranted. However, if the spectral function has sharp peaks more care is necessary. A simple example is the spectral function $S(\omega) = \gamma\lambda^2/[\lambda^2 + (\omega - \omega_0)^2]$ (we use the notation $\hbar = 1$). If an energy splitting of the system is close to the peak at $\omega = \omega_0$, it is possible to consider the height of the peak (γ) as the strength of the coupling, whereas the width of the peak (λ) gives us a good indication of the decay time of the bath correlator. Then, for $\gamma/\lambda \gg 1$ we are in the strong-coupling limit and for $\gamma/\lambda \ll 1$ we are in the weak-coupling limit.

In this article, we investigate a situation with a bath spectral density which has a substantial spectral weight at low frequencies. If the effect of temperature is considered, we will have a spectral function peaked at zero frequency which is exactly in the strong coupling limit, i.e. its peak is higher than it is wide. As we will discuss later, this spectral function can be a result of coupling a quantum system to a large Ohmic resistor[14], in which case we have an Ohmic spectral density with small cut-off frequency. We will also discuss how our noise spectrum can be considered as a subcomponent of $1/f$-noise[15]. Furthermore, the spectral density relevant for our work has been measured, e.g. in flux qubits, which are used in the D-Wave devices[16,17]. In larger coupled systems containing these qubits, a description based on polaronic hopping/tunneling has also already been studied[18]. The same physics also govern inelastic charge hopping across biased tunnel junctions in series with a large resistor, studied recently in the context of nonclassical microwave production[19].

II. THE MODEL

We consider a Hamiltonian of the form,

$$H_0 = H_D + (\hat{T} + \hat{T}^\dagger) + \hat{D}\sum_i c_i(\hat{b}_i^\dagger + \hat{b}_i) + \sum_i \omega_i \hat{b}_i^\dagger \hat{b}_i. \quad (1)$$

The system Hamiltonian consists of H_D, a Hamiltonian which commutes with the coupling operator $\hat{D}$, and a part which does not commute with $\hat{D}$, given by $\hat{T}+\hat{T}^\dagger$. The system is coupled to a bath described by bosonic modes with frequencies ω_i and the corresponding annihilation (and creation) operators $\hat{b}_i^{(\dagger)}$. For the following to be valid we need that the commutator of the operators $\hat{T}$ and $\hat{D}$ is given by

$$[\hat{T},\hat{D}] = c\hat{T}, \tag{2}$$

where c is a constant. In Section III we introduce several systems where this relation is valid.

Provided by Eq. (2), it is now convenient to do the unitary (polaron) transformation

$$U_D = \exp\left[-\hat{D}\sum_i \frac{c_i}{\omega_i}(\hat{b}_i^\dagger - \hat{b}_i)\right], \tag{3}$$

and bring the resulting Hamiltonian into the standard form of a system-bath approach,

$$H = U_D^\dagger H_0 U_D = H_{\rm S} + H_{\rm C} + H_{\rm B}, \tag{4}$$

with

$$H_{\rm S} = H_D - \hat{D}^2\sum_i \frac{c_i^2}{\omega_i} \tag{5}$$

$$H_{\rm C} = \hat{T}e^{-\hat{\phi}} + \hat{T}^\dagger e^{\hat{\phi}}\ ,\ \phi = c\sum\frac{c_i}{\omega_i}(\hat{b}_i^\dagger - \hat{b}_i) \tag{6}$$

$$H_{\rm B} = \sum_i \omega_i \hat{b}_i^\dagger \hat{b}_i. \tag{7}$$

The system Hamiltonion $H_{\rm S}$ consists of H_D (introduced above) and a renormalisation coming from the bath. Coupling to the bath is described by $H_{\rm C}$ and the bath Hamiltonian remains unchanged. It will now be our goal to derive a master equation by expanding the equation of motion for the reduced density matrix.

III. PHYSICAL REALISATIONS

Prior to the unitary transformation the system Hamiltonian has a diagonal part

$$H_D = \sum_n \epsilon_n |n\rangle\langle n|. \tag{8}$$

We will consider an off-diagonal part with coupling between the nearest system levels

$$\hat{T} = \sum_n \tau_n |n\rangle\langle n+1|. \tag{9}$$

In this case the coupling to the bath can be described by the operator

$$\hat{D} = \sum_n d_n |n\rangle\langle n|. \tag{10}$$

For our theory to be applicable, that is Eq. (2) to be valid, the matrix elements d_n need to have the property $d_{n+1} - d_n = c$. However, it should be pointed out that the approach can be extended even to more complicated operators $\hat{T}$. We will now discuss some important models from the literature which can be mapped to the Hamiltonian in Eq. (1).

A. Spin-Boson Model

One of the most well studied problems in system-bath physics is the spin-boson model[20,21]. It describes many interesting systems and phenomena, like electron transfer reactions[22], bio-molecules[23], cavity-QED[24,25] and general dissipative quantum systems[26,27]. It is based on the Hamiltonian,

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \frac{1}{2}\epsilon\hat{\sigma}_z - \frac{1}{2}\Delta\hat{\sigma}_x \\ &\quad + \hat{\sigma}_z\sum_i c_i(\hat{b}_i^\dagger + \hat{b}_i) + \sum_i \omega_i \hat{b}_i^\dagger \hat{b}_i. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Here $\hat{\sigma}_i$ are the Pauli-matrices acting on a two-level system. This can be mapped onto the Hamiltonian in Eq. (1), with identification

$$H_D = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon\hat{\sigma}_z \quad , \quad \hat{T} = -\frac{1}{2}\Delta\hat{\sigma}_+ \quad , \quad D = \hat{\sigma}_z, \tag{12}$$

where we introduced the raising and lowering operators $\hat{\sigma}_+ + \hat{\sigma}_- = \hat{\sigma}_x$. For the spin-boson model an expansion in $\hat{T}$ in lowest order is known as the non-interacting blip approximation[9]. Also higher order expansions have been formulated[12,13].

B. Jaynes-Cummings Model

The Jaynes-Cummings model describes an interaction between a single electromagnetic mode and a two-level system. If the two-level system is coupled to a bosonic bath (eg. to describe decoherence) the total Hamiltonian is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \frac{1}{2}\epsilon\hat{\sigma}_z + g(\hat{\sigma}_+\hat{a} + \hat{\sigma}_-\hat{a}^\dagger) + \omega\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a} \\ &\quad + \hat{\sigma}_z\sum_i c_i(\hat{b}_i^\dagger + \hat{b}_i) + \sum_i \omega_i\hat{b}_i^\dagger\hat{b}_i. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

This model has been studied, for example, in the context of inversionless lasing[28] and coupling of quantum dots to a transmission-line resonator[29,30]. We have here

$$H_D = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon\hat{\sigma}_z + \omega\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a} \quad , \quad \hat{T} = g\hat{a}\hat{\sigma}_+ \quad , \quad \hat{D} = \hat{\sigma}_z. \tag{14}$$

When expanding in $\hat{T}$ one has to note that the expansion parameter grows with the photon number. Therefore it is clear that a lowest-order approximation is only valid for small photon numbers (small $g\sqrt{n}$ compared to ω, where n is the resonator photon number).

C. Superconducting devices in the charge regime

Systems of great interest, where the above discussion is valid, are superconducting devices in the charge regime. As an example, the Hamiltonian of a superconducting charge qubit connected (capacitively) to a transmission line can be written in the form,

$$\begin{aligned} H &= E_C\hat{N}^2 - E_{\rm J}\cos\hat{\theta} \\ &+ \hat{N}\sum_i c_i(\hat{b}_i^\dagger + \hat{b}_i) + \sum_i \omega_i \hat{b}_i^\dagger \hat{b}_i. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Here $\hat{N}$ is the excess Cooper-pair number on the island with Cooper-pair charging energy E_C, and $E_{\rm J}$ is the Josephson coupling describing Cooper-pair tunneling between the island and the lead. The superconducting phase and the charge operator are conjugate variables and satisfy $[\hat{N}, e^{i\hat{\theta}}] = e^{i\hat{\theta}}$, which means that we can identify,

$$H_D = E_C\hat{N}^2 \ , \ \hat{T} = -E_{\rm J}e^{i\hat{\theta}}/2 \ , \ \hat{D} = \hat{N}. \tag{16}$$

For this case the lowest-order expansion is similar to the $P(E)$-theory[14]. There, one evaluates charge tunneling rates across a voltage-biased tunnel junction in series with a resistive environment, which corresponds to $H_D = -2eV\hat{N}$, with V as the voltage bias, and other terms as above. In this system also expansion schemes to higher-orders in $E_{\rm J}$ have been demonstrated[19,31,32]. Of course many other noise sources, like sub-gap quasiparticles[33,34], can have an effect on supercondcuting systems. In the limit of large $E_{\rm J}$ the noise characteristics of this model can also change substantially[35] and for highly structured environments open system methods have been discussed[36].

D. Multi-partite systems

The model presented here can also easily be extended to include coupling of many system operators to independent baths. Then each of the system operators has to have a similar relation with the system Hamiltonian as shown in Eq. (2). In particular, this model can be used to study incoherent Cooper-pair tunneling in Josephson junction arrays[37,38], and it could also be useful when considering hopping between many coupled two-level systems with low coherence[39,40].

IV. EXPANSION ON KELDYSH-CONTOUR

The total Hamiltonian H is divided into three parts: the quantum system $H_{\rm S}$, the bath $H_{\rm B}$, and the coupling between the quantum system and the bath $H_{\rm C}$, see Eqs. (4-7). Our aim is to derive an equation of motion for the reduced density matrix for the quantum system, where we trace out the degrees of freedom of the bath. The expansion of the time evolution on Keldysh contour is dicussed extensively in the literature, see for example Ref. [41]. Below, we will give a short review of the relevant steps. Differences to usual approaches appear when we introduce the contraction method of exponentialized bosonic operators, done in Section IV A.

We start with the equation of motion for the average value of the projection operator $\hat{P}_{ss'}$, where $|s\rangle$ are the eigenstates of $H_{\rm S}$. We have then

$$\hat{P}_{ss'} = |s'\rangle\langle s| \ \ , \ \ H_{\rm S}|s\rangle = E_s|s\rangle. \tag{17}$$

In this notation we can define the elements of the reduced density matrix as

$$P_{ss'}(t) = \left\langle \hat{P}_{ss'}(t) \right\rangle. \tag{18}$$

The time evolution is then given by,

$$P_{ss'}(t) = {\rm Tr}\left[\hat{\rho}(t_0)\hat{U}_{\rm I}^\dagger(t,t_0)\hat{P}_{ss',{\rm I}}(t)\hat{U}_{\rm I}(t,t_0)\right]. \tag{19}$$

Here we use the definition of an operator $\hat{O}$ in the interaction picture

$$\hat{O}_{\rm I}(t) = e^{i(H_{\rm S}+H_{\rm B})(t-t_0)}\hat{O}e^{-i(H_{\rm S}+H_{\rm B})(t-t_0)}. \tag{20}$$

The time-evolution operator in the interaction picture is given by

$$U_{\rm I}(t,t_0) = \mathcal{T}e^{-i\int_{t_0}^t H_{\rm C,I}(t')dt'} \tag{21}$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ is the time-ordering operator ($t > t_0$).

We assume now that at time t_0 the density matrix separates into the density matrix of the bath $\hat{\rho}_{\rm B}(t)$ and system $\hat{\rho}_{\rm S}(t_0)$, and write it in the form

$$\hat{\rho}(t_0) = \hat{\rho}_{\rm B}(t_0)\hat{\rho}_{\rm S}(t_0) = \hat{\rho}_{\rm B}\sum_{\bar{s}\bar{s}'} P_{\bar{s}\bar{s}'}(t_0)|\bar{s}\rangle\langle\bar{s}'|. \tag{22}$$

Combining Eqs. (19) and (22) allows us to write,

$$P_{ss'}(t) = \sum_{\bar{s}\bar{s}'} P_{\bar{s}\bar{s}'}(t_0)\Pi_{\bar{s}\bar{s}'\to ss'}(t_0,t), \tag{23}$$

with the time-evolution of the super-operator $\Pi(t_0,t)$. Expanding the time-evolution operators as in Eq. (21) gives us

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pi_{\bar{s}\bar{s}'\to ss'}(t_0,t) \\ &= \langle\bar{s}'|{\rm Tr}_{\rm B}\rho_{\rm B}(t_0)\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}(-i)^m\int_{t_0}^t dt_1'\int_{t_0}^{t_1'}dt_2'\ldots \\ &\int_{t_0}^{t_{m-1}'} dt_m' \mathcal{T}_K\{H_{\rm C,I}(t_1')H_{\rm C,I}(t_2')\ldots H_{\rm C,I}(t_m')\hat{P}_{ss',{\rm I}}(t)\}|\bar{s}\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Here $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{K}}$ represents the time sorting *along the Keldysh contour*, which we will explain below. The Keldysh contour has two branches. The upper branch represents the

time evolution from t_0 to t, and the lower branch represents time-evolution in the opposite direction. In our case the time t is determined by the projection operator $\hat{P}_{ss',\mathrm{I}}(t)$. All operators to the right of $\hat{P}_{ss',\mathrm{I}}(t)$ will be on the upper branch of the Keldysh contour, all operators to the left will be on the lower branch. Each lower-branch operator will be associated with an extra factor -1.

In the coupling Hamiltonian we have the operators $\hat{T}e^{-\hat{\phi}(t)}$ and $\hat{T}^\dagger e^{\hat{\phi}(t)}$. We separate these two terms in our description of the expansion on Keldysh contour. The operators $\hat{T}e^{-\hat{\phi}(t)}$ are represented by filled circles, while $\hat{T}^\dagger e^{\hat{\phi}(t)}$ by empty circles. On Keldysh contour the time-evolution of the super-operator is then given by

$$\Pi(t_0,t) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} i^m$$



(25)

Here, for each order m a summation over all geometrically different diagrams is made.

To define a self-energy we will now establish contraction rules for correlators of the form

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Tr}_\mathrm{B}\left[\hat{\rho}_\mathrm{B}(t_0)\mathcal{T}_K e^{\hat{\phi}_1}e^{-\hat{\phi}_2}e^{\hat{\phi}_3}\dots e^{\hat{\phi}_m}\right] \\ &= \left\langle \mathcal{T}_K e^{\hat{\phi}_1}e^{-\hat{\phi}_2}e^{\hat{\phi}_3}\dots e^{\hat{\phi}_m}\right\rangle_\mathrm{B} \\ &= \left\langle e^{\hat{\phi}_m}e^{-\hat{\phi}_{m-2}}\dots e^{-\hat{\phi}_2}e^{\hat{\phi}_1}e^{\hat{\phi}_3}\dots e^{-\hat{\phi}_{m-1}}\right\rangle_\mathrm{B},\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where the time-ordering of the lowest line corresponds to the diagram in Eq. (25). We have used the notation $\hat{\phi}(t_i) \equiv \hat{\phi}_i$. It is the next step which is different from usual master equation derivations. This is since the Wick's theorem does not apply to operators of the type $\exp\left[\hat{\phi}_i\right]$ and we cannot simply rewrite this m-time correlator in products of two-time correlators.

A. Contraction rules

The Feynman disentangling method allows us to derive a helpful simplification for ensemble averages of products of operators $\exp\left(\hat{\phi}_n\right)$, where $\hat{\phi}_n$ is an arbitrary linear combination of bosonic annihilation and creation operators. The disentangling has the form

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle e^{n_1\hat{\phi}_1}e^{n_2\hat{\phi}_2}\dots e^{n_m\hat{\phi}_m}\right\rangle \\ &= e^{\frac{1}{2}\langle\left(\sum_{i=1}^m n_i\hat{\phi}_i\right)^2\rangle}e^{\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i<j}^m\left[n_i\hat{\phi}_i,n_j\hat{\phi}_j\right]}.\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Here, the factors n_i are considered to take values ± 1. This result can also be derived by applying the Wick's theorem to Taylor expansions of the exponentialized operators[14]. Using Eq. (27) it is straightforward to show that averaging products over the reservoir is only non-zero if there is the same number of operators with opposite signs of the exponents. Therefore, we only have to consider diagrams with equal amount of filled and empty circles, which correspond to averages of the form

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle \mathcal{T}_K \Pi_n e^{\hat{\phi}_n}e^{-\hat{\phi}_{n'}}\right\rangle \\ &= e^{\frac{1}{2}\left\langle[\sum_n(\hat{\phi}_n-\hat{\phi}_{n'})]^2\right\rangle}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{n<n'}\mathcal{T}_K[\hat{\phi}_n,\hat{\phi}_{n'}]} \\ &\times\ e^{\frac{1}{2}\sum_{n<m}\mathcal{T}_K[\hat{\phi}_n,\hat{\phi}_m]}e^{\frac{1}{2}\sum_{n'<m'}\mathcal{T}_K[\hat{\phi}_{n'},\hat{\phi}_{m'}]},\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Here we use the notation where the number i (i') corresponds to a positive (negative) signed phase operator.

In the next step we group all $e^{\hat{\phi}_n}$ to the $e^{-\hat{\phi}_{n'}}$ closest to each other on the real time axis. This is done in a way that the first pair is formed from the timewise earliest empty circle and timewise earliest filled circle, and so on. The difference to usual diagramatic formulations is that each circle is paired only once. Interactions beyond these pairings are included by pair connectors, introduced below. To write the resulting correlators in a compact form we introduce the notation

$$f(\mathcal{T}_\mathcal{K}[t_1,t_2,t_3,\dots]) = f(t_1,t_2,t_3,\dots). \tag{29}$$

The expression $\mathcal{T}_\mathcal{K}[t_1,t_2,t_3,\dots]$ implies that the arguments of the function f should be time sorted along the Keldysh contour. For the particular example in Eq. (29) we assumed $t_1 > t_2 > t_3, \dots$ along the Keldysh contour.

We then separate contributions from the timewise nearby pairs (introduced above) from other terms, that will describe interaction between these pairs. This allows us to bring the correlator into the form,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle \mathcal{T}_K \Pi_n e^{\hat{\phi}_n}e^{-\hat{\phi}_{n'}}\right\rangle \\ &= \Pi_n\left\langle \mathcal{T}_K e^{\hat{\phi}_n}e^{-\hat{\phi}_{n'}}\right\rangle \Pi_{n<m}\left(F(\mathcal{T}_K[t_n,t_{n'},t_m,t_{m'}])+1\right) \\ &= \Pi_n P(\mathcal{T}_\mathcal{K}[t_n,t_{n'}]) \\ &+ \Pi_n P(\mathcal{T}_\mathcal{K}[t_n,t_{n'}])\rangle F(\mathcal{T}_K[t_2,t_{2'},t_1,t_{1'}])+\dots.\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

The two-time correlator $P(t_1,t_2)$ has the form

$$P(t_1,t_2) = \left\langle e^{\hat{\phi}(t_1)}e^{-\hat{\phi}(t_2)}\right\rangle = e^{C(t_1-t_2)}. \tag{31}$$

Here, the pair correlator $C(t)$ is related to the bath structure as

$$\begin{aligned}C(t) &= \frac{c^2}{\pi}\int_0^\infty \frac{J(\omega)}{\omega^2} \\ &\times \left[\coth\left(\frac{\omega}{2k_\mathrm{B}T}\right)(\cos\omega t-1) - i\sin\omega t\right],\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where we have taken the continuum limit by defining $\pi\sum_i c_i^2 f(\omega_i)/\omega_i^2 \equiv \int d\omega J(\omega)f(\omega)/\omega^2$, for an arbitrary function $f(\omega)$. The Fourier transform of Eq. (31) is known from the $P(E)$-theory[14],

$$P(E) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{C(t)+iE}. \tag{33}$$

It satisfies $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P(E)dE = 1$ and describes the probability to exchange energy E with the bosonic environment in an incoherent transition between two system states connected by $\hat{T}$ or $\hat{T}^\dagger$. As discussed more detailed in Section V, the function $J(\omega)$ is related to the real part of the environmental impedance $Z(\omega)$ as $J(\omega) = 2\pi\omega \mathrm{Re}(Z(\omega))/R_\mathrm{Q}$, where $R_\mathrm{Q} = h/e^2$ is the resistance quantum.

The interaction between the pairs is described by the function

$$F(\mathcal{T}_K[t_n, t_{n'}, t_m, t_{m'}]) = e^{\left\langle \mathcal{T}_K(\hat{\phi}_n - \hat{\phi}_{n'})(\hat{\phi}_m - \hat{\phi}_{m'})\right\rangle} - 1, \quad (34)$$

where the first term on the right-hand side collects all the terms describing interaction between two pairs. The definition is reasonable because, for example, at finite temperatures the function F decays exponentially to zero with increasing time separation between two pairs. We call the function $F(\mathcal{T}_K[t_n, t_{n'}, t_m, t_{m'}])$ a **connector**.

We are now ready to go forward in using our diagrammatic formulation of the problem. As an example we show a contraction of an element of the time evolution, with six vertices,



(35)

Here the dashed lines describe connectors between the pair correlators (wiggled lines).

B. Selfenergy

Since the diagrams can be both separable and inseparable, we can now define the selfenergy[41], consisting of all inseparable diagrams. In diagrammatic form it can be written as,



(36)

Using the selfenergy we can write the time evolution $\Pi(t_0, t)$ as



(37)

Using the Dyson equation shown above we get the equation of motion for the reduced density matrix

$$\partial_t \hat{P}(t) = i[\hat{P}(t), H_\mathrm{S}] + \int_{t_0}^{t} \Sigma(t', t)\hat{P}(t')dt', \quad (38)$$

which is in principle exact. Obviously, it is the key difficulty here to calculate the selfenergy $\Sigma(t', t)$. We will now derive the leading-order approximation for the equation of motion.

C. Leading-order approximation

The leading-order master equation is a very useful and straightforward tool for numerous situations. Our derived diagrammatic formulation of higher orders then allows us to study convergence criteria, which will be performed in Section V. The selfenergy in the leading order is a sum of all eight second-order diagrams, which have the form



(39)

Evaluating each contribution explicitly we can write down the master equation. As an example, we evaluate the contribution from the first diagram,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Sigma_{\bar{s}\bar{s}'\to s s'}(t', t)\\ &= \langle \bar{s}'|\hat{T}|s'\rangle\langle s|\hat{T}^\dagger|\bar{s}\rangle P(t', t)e^{i(E_{s'} - E_{\bar{s}})(t-t')}.\end{aligned}$$

In the Markov approximation, one neglects memory effects in the system time-evolution, which means that in Eq. (38) the density matrix $\hat{P}(t')$ is replaced by the free evolution $e^{iH_\mathrm{S}(t-t')}\hat{P}(t)e^{-iH_\mathrm{S}(t-t')}$. This allows for a straightforward integration of the equations over the time t', giving generalized transition rates of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(E) &\equiv \int_{-\infty}^{t} dt' P(t', t)e^{-iE(t-t')} \quad (40)\\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{t} dt' e^{C(t'-t)}e^{iE(t'-t)} = \pi P(E) + iR(E).\end{aligned}$$

Here, the first term on the right-hand side is purely real and corresponds to the $P(E)$-function in Eq. (33). This describes incoherent transitions with energy exchange with the environment. The second term is purely imaginary and corresponds to energy renormalization effects. These are usually neglected or included into the system Hamiltonian. This term can also be written in the form

$$R(E) = -\mathcal{P}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{P(E+\omega)}{\omega}, \quad (41)$$

where $\mathcal{P}$ indicates that the integration is made as a principal-value around $\omega = 0$.

In total, after summing over all the eight diagrams, one obtains the well-known Bloch-Redfield equations of motion[1,3]

$$\dot{P}_{ss'}(t) \;=\; -i(E_s - E_{s'})P_{ss'}(t) + \sum_{\bar{s}\bar{s}'} \Pi_{\bar{s}\bar{s}'ss}(t), \quad (42)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_{\bar{s}\bar{s}'ss}(t) \;&=\; \Gamma_{\bar{s}'s'}\left[T^{\dagger}_{s\bar{s}}T_{\bar{s}'s'} + T_{s\bar{s}}T^{\dagger}_{\bar{s}'s'}\right]P_{\bar{s}\bar{s}'}(t)\\ &+\; \Gamma^{*}_{\bar{s}s}\left[T^{\dagger}_{\bar{s}s}T_{\bar{s}'s'} + T_{\bar{s}s}T^{\dagger}_{\bar{s}'s'}\right]P_{\bar{s}\bar{s}'}(t)\\ &-\; \sum_{v}\Gamma^{*}_{\bar{s}v}\left[T^{\dagger}_{sv}T_{v\bar{s}} + T_{sv}T^{\dagger}_{v\bar{s}}\right]P_{\bar{s}\bar{s}'}(t)\delta_{\bar{s}'s'}\\ &-\; \sum_{v}\Gamma_{\bar{s}'v}\left[T^{\dagger}_{\bar{s}'v}T_{vs'} + T_{\bar{s}'v}T^{\dagger}_{vs'}\right]P_{\bar{s}\bar{s}'}(t)\delta_{\bar{s}s},\end{aligned}$$

with $T_{ij} \equiv \langle i|\hat{T}|j\rangle$ and $\Gamma_{ij} \equiv \Gamma(E_i) - \Gamma(E_j)$.

V. STRONG LOW-FREQUENCY NOISE AND CONVERGENCE

In the previous section we have presented a diagrammatic expansion of the time evolution of the density matrix and shortly derived the master equation in the leading order. We now want to discuss the conditions for the leading-order expansion to be valid. For this we first want to introduce a specific model for the spectral function. After this we address the conditions for considering the self-energy only in lowest order.

A. An ohmic environment with small cut-off frequency

We want to consider a case which is often discussed within $P(E)$-theory, where the spectral function can be related to an impedance $Z(\omega)$ via

$$J(\omega) = 2\pi\omega\frac{\mathrm{Re}[Z(\omega)]}{R_{\mathrm{Q}}} \quad (43)$$

where $R_{\mathrm{Q}} = h/e^2$ is the resistance quantum. If our system has a dipole moment and is capacitively coupled to an Ohmic environment, the impedance can take the form

$$\mathrm{Re}[Z(\omega)] = \frac{R}{1+(\omega RC)^2} \quad (44)$$

Here R characterizes the dissipation of the environment and the capacitance C defines a cut-off frequency $\omega_R = 1/RC$. The spectral density in this case can also be written as,

$$J(\omega) = 2\epsilon_C\omega\frac{\omega_R}{\omega^2+\omega_R^2} \quad (45)$$

with the charging energy $\epsilon_C = e^2/2C$. If we consider the occupation of the modes by finite temperature k_BT, for small cut-off frequencies, $\omega_R \ll k_BT$, we get a spectral function,

$$S(\omega) = J(\omega)\coth(\omega/2k_BT) \approx \frac{4\epsilon_C k_BT\omega_R}{\omega^2+\omega^R}\,. \quad (46)$$

This spectral function has a maximum at $\omega = 0$ and therefore the noise we are considering is low frequency noise. It should also be noted that there is a direct relation between the spectral function (46) and $1/f$ noise[42]. It is known that $1/f$ noise can be described by many superimposed Lorentzian spectra, with a probability distribution for the width ω_R which is given by $1/\omega_R$,

$$S_{1/f}(\omega) = \int_0^{\infty} d\omega_R \frac{1}{\omega_R} S(\omega) = \frac{2\pi\epsilon_C k_BT}{\omega} \quad (47)$$

As we will see later, the expansion we discuss here can accommodate low frequency noise of the type described by Eq. (46) for rather small cut-off frequencies ω_R, but not for $\omega_R \to 0$.

We study now further the spectral density of Eq. (45) in the limit $\omega_R \ll k_BT$. The corresponding contraction function $P(t_1,t_2)$, see Eqs. (31-32), has the form

$$\begin{aligned}&P(t_1,t_2) = \quad (48)\\ &\exp\left\{-\frac{2c^2\epsilon_C k_BT\left(1-e^{-\omega_R|\delta t|}-\omega_R|\delta t|\right)}{\omega_R^2}\right.\\ &\left.-i\frac{2c^2\epsilon_C(1-e^{-\omega_R|\delta t|})}{\omega_R}\mathrm{Sign}(\delta t)\,.\right\}\end{aligned}$$

Here we have defined $\delta t = t_1 - t_2$. We will now use the coupling $c = 1$, for other values all the results can be obtained by the change $\epsilon_C \to c^2\epsilon_C$. In the limit $\omega_R \ll \sqrt{\epsilon_C k_BT}$ (which also corresponds to an approximation for short times) the relevant behaviour simplifies to

$$P(t_1,t_2) \approx \exp\left\{-\epsilon_C\left[k_BT(t_1-t_2)^2 + i(t_1-t_2)\right]\right\}. \quad (49)$$

This also implies that we consider a spectral function which is sharply peaked at small frequencies. Below we consider the contractions to have the form given by Eq. (49).

B. Analysis of higher-order diagrams

Here we analyze higher-order diagrams to understand the convergence conditions of our expansion. At first we will consider a standard diagram with two crossed contractions,



$$= m^4\int_{t'}^{t} dt_1 \int_{t'}^{t_1} dt_2 P(t,t_2)P(t',t_1) \quad (50)$$

Here, the term $P(t,t_2)$ corresponds to the upper pair and $P(t',t_1)$ to the lower one. Here we made several assumptions. We assume that the relevant system energy splittings are small. If a system energy splitting is large, we

get additional oscillating functions which improve convergence, therefore we are considering the worst-case scenario. The prefactor is given by the assumption that there is a characteristic energy scale m which corresponds to the relevant matrix element $m \propto \langle n|\hat{T}|n'\rangle$ where $|n\rangle$ and $|n'\rangle$ are eigenstates of the system.

In a rough approximation, where we also neglect the oscillating part in the contraction of Eq. (49) and assuming that $t-t'$ is relatively large, we find

$$\approx -\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}\frac{m^4 e^{-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_C k_{\rm B}T(t-t')^2}}{(\epsilon_C k_{\rm B}T)^{3/2}(t-t')} \tag{51}$$

If we now compare the size of the lowest-order diagram with this results we see that we need,

$$\frac{m^2}{\sqrt{\epsilon_C k_B T}} \gg \frac{m^4}{(\epsilon_C k_B T)^{3/2}}\,. \tag{52}$$

This gives us the rule for convergence,

$$\frac{m}{\sqrt{\epsilon_C k_B T}} \ll 1. \tag{53}$$

Basically we see that the higher-order diagram of the form (51) can be neglected if the contraction $P(t_1,t_2)$ has a decay rate which is much larger than the coupling constant m. This is a well known rule which applies for many expansion theories.

In the limit we are considering, at first sight it seems as if the cut-off frequency of the spectral function plays no role for the convergence. However, this is essential for different set of diagrams, which have no crossing contractions but are inseparable because of a connector. These terms have the form



$$= m^4 \int_{t'}^{t} dt_1 \int_{t'}^{t_1} dt_2 P(t,t_1)P(t_2,t')F(t_2,t,t_1,t') \tag{54}$$

Here, the function $P(t,t_1)$ describes the timewise later pair and the function $P(t_2,t')$ the earlier one, whereas $F(t_2,t,t_1,t')$ the interaction between the two. We know that the functions $P(t_1,t)$ and $P(t',t_2)$ decay very fast. Therefore, we expand the connector F around $t_1=t$ and $t_2=t'$ using the Taylor expansion. This is again a valid approximation for relatively large $t-t'$. The lowest-order nonzero element of this expansion is given by,

$$\left.\frac{\partial F}{\partial t_1 \partial t_2}\right|_{t_1=t,t_2=t'} = -\frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\infty d\omega J(\omega)\coth\left(\frac{\omega}{2k_B T}\right)$$
$$\times\left[\cos\omega(t-t') - i\sin\omega(t-t')\right]. \tag{55}$$

In this approximation we can write the diagram (54) in the form

$$= -m^4 \left.\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial t_1 \partial t_2}\right|_{t_1=t,t_2=t'} \times \tag{56}$$
$$\int_{t'}^{t} dt_1 \int_{t'}^{t_1} dt_2 P(t,t_1)(t-t_1)P(t_2,t')(t_2-t').$$

Integration over the times gives us

$$\lim_{t-t'\to\infty}\int_{t'}^{t} dt_1 \int_{t'}^{t_1} dt_2 P(t_1,t)(t_1-t)P(t',t_2)(t_2-t')$$
$$= \frac{1}{\epsilon_C^2 (k_{\rm B}T)^2}. \tag{57}$$

Using the approximation for our spectral density in Eq. (45) as specified in Eq. (46), we can analytically estimate the contribution from the connector,

$$\left.\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial t_1 \partial t_2}\right|_{t_1=t,t_2=t'} = 2\epsilon_C k_{\rm B}T e^{-\omega_R(t-t')}. \tag{58}$$

This analysis implies that for relatively large times $t-t'$ the connector decays as the memory (RC) time of the environment. From this we find the order of magnitude of the contribution of the diagram (54), which becomes $m^4/\epsilon_C k_{\rm B}T\omega_R$. If we compare this to the contribution of the lowest order diagram, we find the convergence rule

$$\frac{m^2}{\omega_R\sqrt{\epsilon_C k_{\rm B}T}} \ll 1. \tag{59}$$

From Eq. (59) we see that a noise source with a rather small cut-off frequency can in fact be treated, as long as the overall noise magnitude is sufficiently large. We also see that the in limit $\omega_R \to 0$ the expansion does not converge. This is natural since in this limit the memory time of the environment approaches infinity. In summary, we see that also the bath cut-off frequency plays an essential role in convergence of the expansion.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We discussed a master-equation expansion where first the coupling to the bath is diagonalized explicitly and then expanded in the system operators dressed by the bath operators. The motivation here is to study expansion schemes that can be used in the case of strong coupling to the environment. We formally introduced contraction rules which allow for the division of all resulting terms in the expansion into two time correlators of type $P(t_1,t_2)$ and four time correlators, described by the connector $F(t_1,t_2,t_3,t_4)$. For the specific case of strong low-frequency noise we showed that the contribution of the connector is important since it contains the effects of the slowly decaying correlations. We then derived explicit limits when the leading-order master-equation approach is valid, that is when the contribution from the two types of diagrams in higher orders stays small. As we discussed in section V A, interesting is the connection of the used noise spectral function to $1/f$-noise. Given a noise spectral function of Eq. (46), we can describe the high-frequency tail of $1/f$-noise,

$$S_{1/f,\rm high} = \int_{\omega_{R,\rm min}}^{\infty} d\omega_R \frac{1}{\omega_R} S(\omega) \tag{60}$$
$$= \frac{2\epsilon_C k_B T\left[\pi - 2\arctan(\omega_{R,\rm min}/\omega)\right]}{\omega}$$

where the low frequency limit for the cut-off frequency ω_R is determined by the condition $m^2/\sqrt{\epsilon_C k_{\rm B} T}\omega_{R,\rm min} \ll 1$.

[1] U. Weiss, "Quantum Dissipative Systems", 3rd ed., World Scientific, 2008.
[2] H. J. Carmichael, "Statistical Methods in Quantum Optics 1", 2nd ed., Springer, 2002.
[3] Y. Makhlin, G. Schön and A. Shnirman, New Directions in Mesoscopic Physics (Towards Nanoscience), pp. 197-224.Eds. R. Fazio, V. F. Gantmakher, and Y. Imry, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 2003.
[4] G. Lindblad, Commun. Math. Phys. **48**, 119 (1976).
[5] J. T Devreese and A. S.Alexandrov, Rep. Prog. Phys. **72**, 066501 (2009).
[6] C. K. Lee, J. Moix and J. Cao, J. Chem. Phys. **136**, 204120 (2012).
[7] D. P. S. McCutcheon and A. Nazir, New J. Phys. **12**, 113042 (2010).
[8] A. Chin and M. Turlakov, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 075311 (2006).
[9] H. Dekker, Phys. Rev. A **35**, 1436 (1987).
[10] M. Thorwart, E. Paladino and M. Grifoni, Chem. Phys. **296**, 333 (2004).
[11] F. K. Wilhelm, S. Kleff, J. von Delft, Chem. Phys. **296**, 345 (2004).
[12] F. Nesi, E. Paladino, M. Thorwart and M. Grifoni, Phys. Rev. B 76, 155323 (2007).
[13] F. Nesi, E. Paladino, M. Thorwart and M. Grifoni. Eur. Phys. Lett. P **80**, 40005 (2007).
[14] G.-L. Ingold and Yu. V. Nazarov, "Single Charge Tunneling", edited by H. Grabert and M. H. Devoret, NATO ASI Series B, Vol. 294, pp. 21-107 (Plenum Press, New York, 1992).
[15] A. Shnirman, G. Schön, I. Martin and Y. Makhlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 127002 (2005).
[16] R. Harris, M.W. Johnson, S. Han, A.J. Berkley, J. Johansson, P. Bunyk, E. Ladizinsky, S. Govorkov, M.C. Thom, S. Uchaikin, B. Bumble, A. Fung, A. Kaul, A. Kleinsasser, M.H.S. Amin, D.V. Averin Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 117003 (2008).
[17] T. Lanting, M. H. S. Amin, M. W. Johnson, F. Altomare, A. J. Berkley, S. Gildert, R. Harris, J. Johansson, P. Bunyk, E. Ladizinsky, E. Tolkacheva and D. V. Averin Phys. Rev. B **83**, 180502(R) (2011).
[18] S. Boixo, V. N. Smelyanskiy, A. Shabani, S. V. Isakov, M. Dykman, V. S. Denchev, M. Amin, A. Smirnov, M. Mohseni, H. Neven, arXiv:1502.05754.
[19] J. Leppäkangas, M. Fogelström, A. Grimm, M. Hofheinz, M. Marthaler, and G. Johansson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115** 027004 (2015).
[20] P. P. Orth, A. Imambekov, K. LeHur, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 014305 (2013).
[21] O. Kashuba, D. M. Kennes, M. Pletyukhov, V. Meden, and H. Schoeller Phys. Rev. B **88**, 165133 (2013).
[22] M. Merkli, G. P. Berman, R. Sayre, J. Math. Chem. **51**, 890 (2013).
[23] A. Garg, J. N. Onuchic, V. Ambegaokar, J. Chem. Phys. **83**, 4491 (1985).
[24] I. Wilson-Rae, A. Imamoglu, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 234311 (2002).
[25] M. Marthaler, J. Leppäkangas, and J. H. Cole, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 180505(R) (2011).
[26] D. P. DiVincenzo, D. Loss, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 035318 (2005).
[27] D. M. Kennes, O. Kashuba, and V. Meden Phys. Rev. B **88**, 241110(R) (2013).
[28] M. Marthaler, Y. Utsumi, D. S. Golubev, A. Shnirman, and G. Schön Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 093901 (2011).
[29] P.-Q. Jin, M. Marthaler, J. H. Cole, A. Shnirman, and G. Schön, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 035322 (2011).
[30] M. Marthaler, Y. Utsumi, and D. S. Golubev, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 184515 (2015).
[31] H. Grabert, G.-L. Ingold, and B. Paul, Europhys. Lett. **44**, 360 (1998).
[32] G.-L. Ingold and H. Grabert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3721 (1999).
[33] J. Leppäkangas, M. Marthaler, and G. Schön, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 060505(R) (2011).
[34] A. Heimes, V. F. Maisi, D. S. Golubev, M. Marthaler, Gerd Schön, and J. P. Pekola, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 014508 (2014).
[35] D. S. Golubev, M. Marthaler, Y. Utsumi, and G. Schön, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 184516 (2010).
[36] J. Leppäkangas, G. Johansson, M. Marthaler, and M. Fogelström, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 267004 (2013).
[37] J. Zimmer, N. Vogt, A. Fiebig, S. V. Syzranov, A. Lukashenko, R. Schäfer, H. Rotzinger, A. Shnirman, M. Marthaler, and A. V. Ustinov, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 144506 (2013).
[38] J. H. Cole, J. Leppäkangas, and M. Marthaler, New J. Phys. **16**, 063019 (2014).
[39] T. F. Ronnow, Z. Wang, J. Job, S. Boixo, S. V. Isakov, D. Wecker, J. M. Martinis, D. A. Lidar, and M. Troyer, Science **345**, 420 (2014).
[40] P. Macha, G. Oelsner, J.-M. Reiner, M. Marthaler, S. Andre, G. Schön, U. Hübner, H.-G. Meyer, E. Ilichev, and A. V. Ustinov, Nature Communications **5**, 5146 (2014).
[41] H. Schoeller and G. Schön, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 18436 (1994).
[42] A. Shnirman, G. Schön, I. Martin, and Y. Makhlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 127002 (2005).